



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,118	10/04/2000	Jon B. Avner	13768.173	7799

22913 7590 09/30/2002

WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/680,118	AVNER ET AL
Examiner	Art Unit	
Monplaisir G Hamilton	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Office Action Summary

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2000 .

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration has reviewed and understands the contents of the specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment specifically referred to in the oath or declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1-2, 4-20, 22-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (Fig 1; pages 2-4) further in view of 5524238 issued to Miller et al, herein referred to as Miller.

Referring to Claim 1, 19, 25:

Applicant's admitted prior art discloses a database engine that accesses and updates objects in a database, the database engine receiving high-level document commands, each high-level document command for performing an operation on a document that is associated with a plurality of tables in the database, a method for allowing client applications to control how a particular high-level document command is implemented in the database, the method comprising the following: an act of receiving a high-level document command meeting certain criteria; an act of identifying one or more client applications that are to be notified of the implementation of the high-level document command; an act of notifying the one or more identified client applications that a high level document command meeting the certain criteria has been received (Fig 1, page 3, lines 17-24; page 4, lines 1-10).

Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose the claimed "an act of receiving instructions from the one or more client applications on how to affect the implementation of the high-level document command in the database; and an act of following the received instructions when implementing the high level document command, or not implementing the high-level document command at all if the received instructions so indicate."

Miller discloses a system that intercepts or filters data being sent between each specific user and the application program. It performs a defined set of functions on the data before passing the data on to the user or application (col 2, lines 55-60). Miller further disclose that the interface control the access of the data as well (col 2, lines 45-50).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a application effect the implementation of a command. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow an interceptor to change the commands (col 2, lines 60-651), thereby producing a user-specific intelligent interface (col; 1, lines 55-60).

Referring to Claim 17, 26:

Applicant's admitted prior art discloses a database management system that includes a database engine that accesses and updates objects in a database, the database engine receiving high-level document commands, each high-level document command for performing an operation on a document that is associated with a plurality of tables in the database, a method for allowing client applications to control how a particular high-level document command is implemented in the database, the method comprising the following: an act of receiving a

high-level document command meeting certain criteria (Fig 1, page 3, lines 17-24; page 4, lines 1-10).

Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose the claimed "step for allowing one or more client applications to affect how the received high-level document command is to be implemented, if at all, in the database."

Miller discloses a system that intercepts or filters data being sent between each specific user and the application program (col 2, lines 55-60).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a application to effect the implementation of a command. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow an interceptor to change the commands (col 2, lines 60-651), thereby producing a user-specific intelligent interface (col; 1, lines 55-60).

Referring to Claim 2 and 20:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 1 and 19 above. Miller further discloses the received instructions are for performing additional high-level document commands in addition to the received high-level document command (col 2, lines 20-25).

Referring to Claim 5:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Miller further discloses the received instructions are for changing how the high-level document command is to be implemented in the database (col 2, lines 20-25).

Referring to Claim 6:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Miller further discloses the received instructions are for preventing the high-level document command from being implemented at all in the database (col 2, lines 45-50).

Referring to Claim 7:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Applicant further discloses the high-level document command is for performing an operation on an electronic mail message (page 3, lines 8-12, 17-20).

Referring to Claim 8:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Applicant further discloses the high-level document command is for performing an operation on a folder that contains electronic mail messages (page 3, lines 8-12, 17-20).

Referring to Claims 9 -13:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Applicant further discloses the high-level document command is for moving, deleting, copying, updating, adding a document (page 3, lines 17-20).

Referring to Claim 14 and 22:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 and 19 above. Mille further disclose the act of notifying the one or more identified client applications comprises an act of transmitting a message to a machine that hosts the client application, the machine that host the client application being different that the machine that hosts the database management system (col 3, lines 54-55).

Referring to Claim 15 and 23:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 1 and 19 above. Mille further disclose the act of notifying the one or more identified client applications comprises an act of passing the notification through a function call to the identified client application, the client application hosted by the same machine at least the portion of the database management system responsible for performing the act of notifying the client applications (col 3, lines 50-52).

Referring to Claim 16:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 1 above. Applicant further disclose the act of receiving instructions from the one or more client applications occurs prior to the act of receiving the high-level document command (col 2, lines 20-25).

Referring to Claim 18:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 17 above. Applicant's admitted prior art in view Miller further discloses step for allowing one or more client applications to affect how the received high-level document command is to be implemented comprises the following: an act of identifying one or more client applications that are to be notified of the implementation of the high-level document command; an act of notifying the one or more identified client applications that a high level document command meeting certain criteria has been received; an act of receiving instructions from the one or more client applications on how to affect the implementation of the high-level document command in the database (Applicant: Fig 1, page 3, lines 17-24; page 4, lines 1-10); and an act of following the received instructions when implementing the high level document command, or not implementing the high-level document command at all if the received instructions so indicate (Miller: col 2, lines 45-50)..

Referring to Claim 24:

Applicant's admitted prior art in view Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claim 19 above. Miller further discloses a computer-readable media comprises one or more physical storage media (col 3, lines 35-40).

4. Claims 3-4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art and Miller as applied to Claims 1-2, 5-16 above, further in view of US Patent 5893128 issued to Nauckhoff.

Referring to Claims 3 and 21:

Applicant's admitted prior art and Miller discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 1 and 20 above.

Applicant's admitted prior art and Miller does not expressly disclose the claimed "additional high-level document commands and the received high-level document command are implemented atomically in the database."

Nauckhoff discloses, that document commands are implemented atomically (col 7, lines 25-35).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the additional commands atomically. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow the system to perform rollback operations if necessary (col 7, lines 29-30)

Referring to Claim 4:

Applicant's admitted prior art and Miller further in view of Nauckhoff disclose the limitations as disclosed in Claim 3 above. Nauckhoff further discloses the additional high-level document command and the received high-level document command are implemented atomically using a group operation (col 8, lines 1-2).

Prior Art

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 5987452 issued to Kung. Kung discloses a technique is provided for translating database queries used to perform database functions on a first database management system so that a user can perform the database functions on one or more second database management systems using the translated database queries.

US Patent issued 5920692 issued to Nguyen. Nguyen discloses an optimized design for a multi-user server architecture for disseminating a variety of real-time application data, such as audio, video, text and motion, while supporting general-purpose tools.

US Patent 5515491 issued to Bates. Bates discloses the method and system of the present invention permits management of communications within a collaborative computer-based system. The collaborative computer-based system includes multiple display devices, a shared data object that is simultaneously accessible by multiple users within the system.

US Patent 5781732 issued to Adams. Adams discloses a Shared Document Framework for use by an application program provides collaborative access to a shared document by means of a caucus service associated with the shared document. The caucus service receives messages from caucus members and broadcast transmits them to all caucus members in global order.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monplaisir G Hamilton whose telephone number is 1703-305-5116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on 1703-305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 1703-746-7239 for regular communications and 1703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 1703-305-3900.

Monplaisir Hamilton
September 26, 2002



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100